

CONCLUDING THE CASE.

THE COURT OF INQUIRY HELD THREE SESSIONS YESTERDAY.

Colonel Jones Under Fire of Cross-Examination for Six Hours—Counsel Arguing the Case—Expect Decision Monday.

When the morning session of the third day of the court of inquiry opened at the regimental armory yesterday there was a little discussion as to the resumption of the minutes of the previous sessions, but no action was taken.

Mr. Meredith then stated that the papers Colonel Jones referred to in his letter of December 1st had not been found, but that he had received a communication from Colonel Nalle, with copies of all the papers involved in the case.

Colonel Jones then stated that he made an effort, upon the receipt of Colonel Nalle's letter, to find the papers in question, and succeeded in finding the minutes of a court-martial held August 1, 1864, to try the Mayo case. The finding was the dishonorable discharge of the accused. He was unable to find the charges. The paper stated that it was a general court-martial, and Second-Lieutenant R. K. Fyfe, of Company F, was the judge-advocate.

After some discussion among counsel the court decided to request the Governor to telegraph to brigade headquarters for the papers in the Mayo case, but this was finally reconsidered, and it was then agreed to settle the point in question by calling Captain Gasser, who happened to be in court, again to the stand.

Captain Gasser stated that in the Department case the question was raised as to the power of Colonel Jones to appoint the court, and the question was overruled on account of irregularities in the charges. The record of that court was forwarded to Colonel Jones.

ABOUT GENERAL COURT-MARTIAL.

A good deal of delay was caused by the examination of orders and other papers, and the proceedings dragged along wearily during the afternoon. Major Evans, when cross-examined by Captain Anderson, stated that when he first took command of the regiment general court-martial were ordered by his authority, but he did not know where they were, and he did not know enough to order through headquarters. The sergeant-major was instructed to keep records of every order that reaches the regiment from brigade headquarters.

Major Evans then argued that the orders issued by Colonel Jones were made to order general court-martial under General Order No. 3, which provides for "court-martial." He thought that sections 1 and 4 gave him that authority. Under that order he thought he was ordered to order general court-martial, or a regimental court-martial, or a company court. The character of the case and the kind of the jurisdiction would guide him in selecting the adjutant general for the purpose of defining the jurisdiction. He did not have any intention to refer to such a court trial of commissioned officers, but only officers of enlisted men.

Colonel Jones repeated his testimony of the previous day when asked by the court that he had made a mistake when he appointed more than eight members on a court, and as soon as the Governor called his attention to this mistake he corrected it. After long deliberations and discussions, witness said he believed that General Order No. 3 was in accord with section 26 of the Code of Virginia, and not in conflict. Article 72 of the Articles of War refers to the appointment of general court-martial. He considered that General Order No. 3 was a regulation, and not in conflict with the Articles of War, and under Articles 72 and 73, without General Order No. 3, any other regulation in existence the colonel of a regiment was not allowed to order a general court-martial, but he was not to do anything in the articles forbidding such ordering.

The court then took a recess until 3:30 P. M.

THE AFTERNOON SESSION.

The afternoon session opened promptly at the appointed hour and Colonel Jones resumed the witness stand. Before he proceeded, however, Captain Anderson stated that he had been informed that Major W. M. Evans, who was formerly assistant adjutant general, had sworn that general courts-martial in the past were ordered by Colonel Jones through brigade headquarters. The court decided that Major Evans should be heard on the subject, and he was summoned forthwith.

Colonel Jones in resuming his testimony said that he had no recollection of appointing a field-officers' court-martial in the case of Private Wilson, of Company F, who was charged with being intoxicated on duty. The court-martial was subsequently discharged. When he appointed, under General Order No. 3, the general court-martial whose members were subsequently censured, he forwarded the papers to Colonel Nalle, and he was appointed, because the question as to his appointing power had been raised. He understood from Colonel Nalle's letter that he should appoint the court under General Order No. 3. He was not prepared to say that he did not intend to do so, but he thought the Mayo case was the first one tried after the endorsement of Colonel Nalle under which the court had been appointed. The Mayo case was ordered by Colonel Jones. The statement made by him in his letter of December 1st, which he made from memory, without having the papers before him, might be inaccurate. He had no intention of desiring to do his officers an injustice. He made the best statement at the time his memory enabled him to do. He believed the instructions from Colonel Nalle to him were to appoint a court-martial, and he thought his later communication would bear him out in this statement.

HE MIXED UP THE NUMBERS.

He said that when he ordered a general court-martial of thirteen he must have mixed up together the number provided for in the Articles of War with that provided for in General Order No. 3. When the court was ordered that Saturday morning, it was done under the order of witness, and with the instruction of Colonel Nalle to continue to do so. The sergeant-major issued orders by order of witness, and for which the latter was responsible, but he could not issue orders to commissioned officers. The latter were issued through the adjutant.

Witness stated that Captain Anderson declined to state his objections in writing, but did not hear him say he would post the judge-advocate as to his views relating to the legality of the court. He did not release Captain Anderson from serving on the court, because he thought an officer should, as a matter of discipline, obey the ruling of a superior officer, unless he was ready to take an appeal.

Witness stated repeatedly that he had never had any doubt as to his right of appointing general courts-martial. The information he received in regard to the action of the court on November 27th was when the proceedings were submitted to him, on December 1st. The members of the court who voted against its illegality were, as he was informed subsequently by Captain Anderson, Cunningham, Lounsbury, Haverly and Russell, of Company B.

At the meeting on December 10th he read to the officers a portion of the letter of the Adjutant-General, which referred to the direction of the Governor. It was to his mind a serious matter to question the authority of an officer in the manner that the court did in regard to the appointing power. He considered that a directing of his authority, instead of the reference of the papers, calling his attention to the fact, was a serious matter. He believed that one or more of the members, when they took the oath, did not intend to truly try the case, but to raise the objection whether he meant that he thought these officers intended to violate their oaths, witness declined to answer categorically. He was, however, both to believe that the officers intended to do wrong, he had no intention to bring any charge; he only gave the impression made on his mind.

WANTED A POSITIVE ANSWER.

Captain Anderson then moved that witness be required to give a positive answer as to whether he thought the officers intended to violate the law. Witness then thought that the intention of the officers was to form the court and then decide that it was illegal, instead of to go on trying the case. He did not desire to cast any reflection upon their integrity by his language.

The purpose of calling the officers together, witness said, was to get further information, the proceedings being the only thing before him. His idea was to secure all possible information and statements so as to be able to settle forever all the discussion that had been going on for at least two years in regard to the appointing of courts-martial. He would have answered the questions of the officers at that meeting, but had not made up his mind clearly, and the attitude of the officers impressed him at the time that he did not want to answer on any avail. He, therefore, did not say anything in reply. He did not return the papers to the court, because, in his opinion, he would not have settled the matter finally.

There were only the army regulations in existence, especially as to courts-martial, that could be easily used as a guide by an officer, but when they did not have sufficient experience. In his opinion an officer should not obey an order which he receives which is absolutely illegal, and he runs the risk then of being court-martialed.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

CAPTAIN ANDERSON STATED, UPON A QUESTION ASKED BY COLONEL MEREDITH, THAT LIEUTENANT CARBANT APPEARED BEFORE THE COURT ON THE PREVIOUS EVENING UPON A TELEGRAPHIC ORDER FROM COLONEL JONES.

Major Evans then argued that the orders issued by Colonel Jones were made to order general court-martial under General Order No. 3, which provides for "court-martial." He thought that sections 1 and 4 gave him that authority. Under that order he thought he was ordered to order general court-martial, or a regimental court-martial, or a company court. The character of the case and the kind of the jurisdiction would guide him in selecting the adjutant general for the purpose of defining the jurisdiction. He did not have any intention to refer to such a court trial of commissioned officers, but only officers of enlisted men.

Colonel Jones repeated his testimony of the previous day when asked by the court that he had made a mistake when he appointed more than eight members on a court, and as soon as the Governor called his attention to this mistake he corrected it. After long deliberations and discussions, witness said he believed that General Order No. 3 was in accord with section 26 of the Code of Virginia, and not in conflict. Article 72 of the Articles of War refers to the appointment of general court-martial. He considered that General Order No. 3 was a regulation, and not in conflict with the Articles of War, and under Articles 72 and 73, without General Order No. 3, any other regulation in existence the colonel of a regiment was not allowed to order a general court-martial, but he was not to do anything in the articles forbidding such ordering.

The court then took a recess until 3:30 P. M.

The afternoon session opened promptly at the appointed hour and Colonel Jones resumed the witness stand. Before he proceeded, however, Captain Anderson stated that he had been informed that Major W. M. Evans, who was formerly assistant adjutant general, had sworn that general courts-martial in the past were ordered by Colonel Jones through brigade headquarters. The court decided that Major Evans should be heard on the subject, and he was summoned forthwith.

Colonel Jones in resuming his testimony said that he had no recollection of appointing a field-officers' court-martial in the case of Private Wilson, of Company F, who was charged with being intoxicated on duty. The court-martial was subsequently discharged. When he appointed, under General Order No. 3, the general court-martial whose members were subsequently censured, he forwarded the papers to Colonel Nalle, and he was appointed, because the question as to his appointing power had been raised. He understood from Colonel Nalle's letter that he should appoint the court under General Order No. 3. He was not prepared to say that he did not intend to do so, but he thought the Mayo case was the first one tried after the endorsement of Colonel Nalle under which the court had been appointed. The Mayo case was ordered by Colonel Jones. The statement made by him in his letter of December 1st, which he made from memory, without having the papers before him, might be inaccurate. He had no intention of desiring to do his officers an injustice. He made the best statement at the time his memory enabled him to do. He believed the instructions from Colonel Nalle to him were to appoint a court-martial, and he thought his later communication would bear him out in this statement.

He said that when he ordered a general court-martial of thirteen he must have mixed up together the number provided for in the Articles of War with that provided for in General Order No. 3. When the court was ordered that Saturday morning, it was done under the order of witness, and with the instruction of Colonel Nalle to continue to do so. The sergeant-major issued orders by order of witness, and for which the latter was responsible, but he could not issue orders to commissioned officers. The latter were issued through the adjutant.

Witness stated that Captain Anderson declined to state his objections in writing, but did not hear him say he would post the judge-advocate as to his views relating to the legality of the court. He did not release Captain Anderson from serving on the court, because he thought an officer should, as a matter of discipline, obey the ruling of a superior officer, unless he was ready to take an appeal.

Witness stated repeatedly that he had never had any doubt as to his right of appointing general courts-martial. The information he received in regard to the action of the court on November 27th was when the proceedings were submitted to him, on December 1st. The members of the court who voted against its illegality were, as he was informed subsequently by Captain Anderson, Cunningham, Lounsbury, Haverly and Russell, of Company B.

At the meeting on December 10th he read to the officers a portion of the letter of the Adjutant-General, which referred to the direction of the Governor. It was to his mind a serious matter to question the authority of an officer in the manner that the court did in regard to the appointing power. He considered that a directing of his authority, instead of the reference of the papers, calling his attention to the fact, was a serious matter. He believed that one or more of the members, when they took the oath, did not intend to truly try the case, but to raise the objection whether he meant that he thought these officers intended to violate their oaths, witness declined to answer categorically. He was, however, both to believe that the officers intended to do wrong, he had no intention to bring any charge; he only gave the impression made on his mind.

WANTED A POSITIVE ANSWER.

Captain Anderson then moved that witness be required to give a positive answer as to whether he thought the officers intended to violate the law. Witness then thought that the intention of the officers was to form the court and then decide that it was illegal, instead of to go on trying the case. He did not desire to cast any reflection upon their integrity by his language.

The purpose of calling the officers together, witness said, was to get further information, the proceedings being the only thing before him. His idea was to secure all possible information and statements so as to be able to settle forever all the discussion that had been going on for at least two years in regard to the appointing of courts-martial. He would have answered the questions of the officers at that meeting, but had not made up his mind clearly, and the attitude of the officers impressed him at the time that he did not want to answer on any avail. He, therefore, did not say anything in reply. He did not return the papers to the court, because, in his opinion, he would not have settled the matter finally.

There were only the army regulations in existence, especially as to courts-martial, that could be easily used as a guide by an officer, but when they did not have sufficient experience. In his opinion an officer should not obey an order which he receives which is absolutely illegal, and he runs the risk then of being court-martialed.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.

Witness did not desire to answer the question as to whether, with the light of the investigation before him, he was still of the opinion that the officers should be held responsible for their conduct.